DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 218 325 TM 820 365

AUTHOR Lotto, Linda S.
TITLE Revisiting the Role of Organizational Effectiveness in Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (66th, New York, NY, March 19-23, 1982); Table 1 is marginally legible due to small print.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation; *Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Needs; *Organizational Effectiveness; Organizational Theories; School Districts

ABSTRACT

Organizational effectiveness ought to play a role in educational evaluation, and the development of alternative perspectives for viewing organizations could be a starting point for revisiting organizational evaluation in education. Five possible perspectives and criteria for evaluating organizations have been developed. If an organization is viewed as an incentive exchange, it could be evaluated in terms of the diversity, equity, and spread of the incentives. If an organization is viewed as an organized anarchy, it could be evaluated in terms of the provision of forums for open discussion, its ability to act, and interpretation of its history. If an organization is viewed as sensemaking, it could be evaluated in terms of its congruence, richness, and access. If an organization is viewed as organizational coupling, it could be evaluated in terms of the buffers it provides, its leadership flexibility, and issue saliency. If an organization is viewed as intraorganizational power and politics, it could be evaluated in terms of its arenas for negotiation, its action, and its use of power. Across all five types of organizations, three indicators of effectiveness emerge: the organization's ability to act; its ability to attribute meaning to its actions; and its ability to encourage individual participation. (Author/BW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED218325

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

REVISITING THE ROLE OF ORGANIZATIONAL EFFECTIVENESS IN EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION

Linda S. Lotto
The Ohio State University

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
L. S. Lotto
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM 820 365

Presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, New York, March 1982.

The Need for Organizational Evaluation in Education

Educational evaluation in America has its roots in two roughly parallel developments (Worthen and Sanders, 1973). The first was the work of Robert Thorndike, father of the educational testing movement. His interests in measuring the changes and developments of human abilities gave great impetus to the growth of measurement technology in the early decades of the twentieth century. The second important development was the schools accreditation movement, which flourished in the later decades of the nineteenth century, establishing and formalizing an early interest in educational accountability. Thus evaluation as we know it today is derived from two distinct, yet complementary traditions: (1) the tests and measurement movement which emphasized measurement technology and individual growth and development; and (2) the schools evaluation or accreditation movement, which emphasized organizational standards of quality.

However, those two branches have diverged so sharply that one, the schools evaluation branch, is no longer commonly associated with evaluation at all. It has become a wholly self-sufficient enterprise, little changed from its original census orientation. For example, the data collected by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education are primarily demographic, e.g., number of faculty holding the doctorate, faculty-student ratio, number of courses in key curricular areas. The schools accreditation enterprise in this country has not pursued the notion of schools evaluation in the sense of organizational effectiveness.

Evaluation as we know it today is a child of the tests and measurement movement. Under its influence evaluation developed a strong orientation to (1) individual growth and development and (2) the experimental paradigm of science. Early evaluations tended to be product-oriented, and pre and posttest designs were used to collect individual achievement data. As evaluators grew more sophisticated and evaluation problems more complex, their work encompassed new foci and methodologies, e.g., process-oriented evaluations which required tools for gathering data not only on outcomes but on the actual instructional process. Stufflebeam's (1971) expansion of evaluation to include context, input, and process as well as product evaluation is exemplary of this increased scope and specification of evaluation problems and the concomitant development of alternative methodologies. More recently evaluators have turned their attention to alternative conceptualizations of evaluation itself. Scriven's goal-free evauation (1976) and Guba's naturalistic evaluation (1978) models present developments not only in the evaluator's repertoire of problems and tools but in his/her conception of the very nature of evaluation.

As a result of its derivation from the testing movement, and the divergence of the schools evaluation movement, evaluation today is firmly fixed on <u>program</u> evaluation accomplished with data on <u>individual</u> program participants. However, many of the questions asked of evaluators (and asked by evaluators of programs) are <u>organizational</u> in nature.

> The usual evaluation produces data on individuals to answer questions about the organization ...One needs organizational data to evaluate organizational activities. It is surprising how often we collect individual data and aggregate it to analyze organizations. (Emphasis in original) (Light, 1979, p. 551)

Evaluators face mounting evidence that despite attempts to devise effective programmatic interventions, education is primarily an organizational enterprise in which unique configurations of individuals and resources in each site have a more powerful effect on the experience of the participant than any particular program or product. This evidence has been primarily manifested in two areas: (1) the literature of policy implementation and innovation adoption; and (2) the literature of school effectiveness.

Evidence from Policy Implementation and Innovation Adoption

A frequent experience of researchers seeking to understand and expedite the process whereby a school adopts an innovation or implements a policy has been that the policy or innovation as implemented appears vastly different from either its intended form or its form in another site. As Berman and McLaughlin, in of major study of the implementation of federally-sponsored innovations, found:

> The adoption of projects did not insure successful implementation; moreover, successful implementation did not guarantee long-run continuation. Neither those policies unique to each federal program nor those policies common to them strongly influenced the fate of adopted innovations. ...All the federal projects had funded some successfully implemented projects as well as dismal failures and many projects in between. The difference between

> success and failure depended primarily on how school districts implemented their projects, not on the type of federal sponsorship. The guidelines and management strategies of the federal change agent programs were simply overshadowed by local concerns and characteristics (1978, p. vi).

Those overriding local concerns and characteristics were primarily organizational in nature, i.e., the quality of working relationships among teachers, the active support of principals, and the effectiveness of project directors (p. 30). Berman and McLaughlin concluded by noting that "adaptive implementation," in which the innovation is adapted to its organizational setting as participants adapt their behavior in response to the policy or innovation, was more effective than the more traditional assumptions of programmed implementation (p. 34).

Paul (1977), in a review of over 100 empirical studies of the change process, reached a similar conclusion:

> The basic logic of the framework suggests that energy introduced into a system, regardless of its source, will be mediated or influenced by system and non-system factors. Over time the mediation will produce an effect that deviates in some degree from the idealized state envisioned at the start of the intervention. There are so many factors which enter into the picture at any time that expectations for achieving the desired effects without deviation are unrealistic. This multitude of factors is not to suggest that program objectives are useless. Rather, what is being suggested is a broader range of understanding to help explain why program effects vary from organization to organization and from one time period to another. (p. 54)

Change agents and innovators no longer view schools as tabulae rasae on which their products, processes, and programs can be imprinted. The current emphasis on linking agents, for example, demonstrates attention to the need for face-to-face interaction,

to the existing belief structures and behavior patterns which define the school organization. School improvement specialists are now becoming aware that school improvement and change will require not merely changes in policies and program but changes in the very life of the school, changes in the organization itself.

Evidence from School Effectiveness Research

What is interesting about school effectiveness research is not that these researchers have used the school as their primary unit of analysis, but that the nature of their findings and conclusions, i.e., the variables most powerfully associated with school (and program success), are organizational rather than programmatic in nature.

Averch (1972), in a major synthesis of this literature from 1950 through 1971, concluded that:

- "Research has not identified a variant of the existing system that is consistently related to students educational outcomes" (p. 154).
- "Research tentatively suggests that improvement in student outcomes, both cognitive and noncognitive, may require sweeping changes in the organization, structure and conduct of educational experiences" (p. 158).

Eight years later Clark, Lotto, and McCarthy (1980) investigating exceptionality in urban elementary schools using case studies, research studies, and elite interviews, were still unable to associate a particular program, practice or policy with student outcomes. In assessing the efficacy of current policies and implementation strategies these researchers concluded that:

> The overwhelming difficulty with the current strategy is that it is based on an assumption which simply is not true, i.e., that legislating conditions associated with successful schools and programs is sufficient to create them. That strategy neglects the need for local schools to deal creatively and sensitively with their unique problems; it neglects the essential element of school change which is changes in people, not changes in things. (p. 202)

Most importantly school effectiveness researchers are finding that the characteristics associated with school (and, not infrequently, program) success are the behavioral and attitudinal characteristics of the school participants, e.g., strong leadership, high expectations for achievement, supportive relationships, time on task (Clark, Lotto, McCarthy, 1980; Edmonds, 1979; Austin, 1979). What seems to distinguish successful schools from not-so-successful schools are the organizational norms and belief systems relevant to the activities and preferences of the school. The literature on school effectiveness demonstrates the essential link between educational outcomes and organizational context. What is important about that context is not the materials and resources it holds or the formal definitions of structure, hierarchy and role which describe it, but the interests and activities, the on-going negotiations among participants, singly and in groups which constitutes day-to-day life in schools.

Summary

Educational evaulation today is, by and large, program evaluation. The traditional interest in individual measurement, governmental needs for program evaluation and the relative

atrophy of a counter-balancing schools evaluation thrust have supported this focus. However evidence from other literatures within education are suggesting the need to look at organizational evaluation. In both the literature of policy implementation and innovation adoption and school effectiveness, evidence suggests that the critical variables related to improvement, change, and effectiveness are organizational rather than programmatic in nature.

Alternative Perspectives for Viewing Organizations

Paralleling the recent growth in evaluation models and technologies has been the development of a number of alternative perspectives for viewing organization. The dominant image of organization in use today is derived from Weber's (1947) rational bureaucracy. This conceptualization posits formal structure, designated roles, task differentiation, authority and centralization as the preeminent variables in understanding how organizations work. A derivative and companion "article of faith" to the bureaucratic image is the "goal attainment paradigm" (Georgiou, 1973). This paradigm explains and describes the organization and its activities solely in terms of goal attainment; the raison d'etre for organization is the attainment of particular set of goals toward which all participants strive.

However, over the past decade there has been a phenomenal growth of interest in the development of alternative images or perspectives for viewing organizations. These have been reported

primarily in the literature of organizational theory, public and business administration. They counter the dominant, bureaucratic perspective and affirm the experiential evidence of many practitioners, i.e., that the norms and structures of the bureaucracy (1) fail to explain many organizational phenomena, and (2) cause us to overlook potentially useful and important phenomena.

Essentially these alternatives tell us that organization is an on-going process of organizing (Weick, 1979) centering on the behavior of people in groups--how they interact, cooperate and compete, how they view themselves within the organization, and how they view the organization in relation to themselves. The organization is no longer viewed as a passive structure upon which practices, programs, and policies can be layered. Rather we now see the organization as a complex of conflicting and competing activities, interests and capabilities.

Since our image of the organization both shapes and constrains our view of organizational effectiveness, one might speculate that these alternative perspectives could be a starting point for revisiting organizational evaluation in education. It is the intent of this paper to describe some criteria for evaluating organizational effectiveness derived from the emerging, alternative perspectives, much as the current and preeminent criteria for evaluating organizational effectiveness have been derived from the bureaucratic and goal-attainment views of organizations.

If we view organizations as goal-attaining entities, then effective organizations will be those that realize their goals. If we view organizations as rational bureaucracies, then effectiveness will be related to the rationality and order of the processes, structures, and roles within the organizations. But if educational organizations can be aptly described as organized anarchies much of the time (Cohen, March, and Olsen, 1972), then it is probably appropriate to consider what an effective organized anarchy might look like.

Five alternative organizational perspectives will be used as theoretical or conceptual bases for looking at organizational effectiveness. The five are: (1) incentive exchanges (Georgiou, 1973), (2) organized anarchies (Cohen, March, and Olsen, 1972), (3) sense-making (Frost and Hayes, 1978), (4) organizational coupling (Weick, 1976), and (5) intraorganizational power and politics (Bacharach and Lawler, 1980). These five were selected on the basis of frequency of citation in the literature, their potential applicability to educational organizations, and their representativeness of the range of alternatives being discussed.

In developing alternative criteria for assessing organizational effectiveness from the five alternative perspectives, key variables and phenomena highlighted by the perspective were used to elicit a value orientation for each perspective. Based on that value orientation, general criterion areas for assessing effectiveness were developed. Table 1 presents these data in overview form. Two themes or assumptions underlie the development of these criteria. The first is that the ultimate

TABLE 1

Perspective	Key Variables and Phenomena	Value Orientation	Criteria for Assessing Effectiveness
Incentive Exchanges	Nature, number and type of incentives Process of incentive exchange	Self interest of individuals	o Diversity--Are a number of different types of incentives available? o Equity--Do most exchanges involve incentives of comparable value? o Spread--Are there multiple sources of critical or valued incentives?
Organized Anarchies	Stream of choices Stream of problems Rate of flow of solutions Attention, time, and energy of participants Process of matching particular choices, problems, solutions, and participants	Need to create rationality	o Garbage cans--Are appropriate fora provided for expressing uncertainty, asserting solutions, and/or airing opinions? o Action--In the face of uncertainty or chaos does the organization act to discover preferences? o Interpretation--What is the meaning of organizational history and present activities?
Sensemaking	Individual and collective cause maps Process of negotiating collective cause maps	Social creation of organizational reality	o Congruence--Is there reasonable congruence across cause maps on individual roles, purposes, and functions? o Richness--Are individuals provided a rich and stimulating stream of experience such that they are able to generate rich and interesting meanings? o Access--Does the negotiation of collective cause maps include a broad representation of organizational participants?

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Perspective	Key Variables and Phenomena	Value Orientation	Criteria for Assessing Effectiveness
Organizational Coupling	Coupling between intentions, processes, and outcomes Coupling between problems, solutions and decisions Coupling between units, levels and individuals	Similar other are more attractive than different others. (Weick, 1980, p. 28)	o Buffers--Do loosely coupled subunits protect the organizational core without making it impermeable? o Leadership Flexibility--Is leadership isomorphic with the various organizational couplings? o Issue Saliency--Do couplings become tight when high saliency issues arise?
Intraorganizational Power and Politics	Sources, types and uses of power Coalitions of individuals and subunits Negotiation	Negotiation and bargaining among and between coalitions	o Arenas--Does the organization provide formal arenas for negotiation and bargaining? o Action--Does bargaining result in action? o Coercion--Is the use of power circumscribed and impersonal?

criterion of organizational effectiveness is the ability to bring diverse individuals together in collective activity. The second is the emphasis on the individual qua individual. The alternative perspectives as a group tend to counter the bureaucratic tendency to regard individuals within organizations as distinguished only by their designated role. The alternatives make us aware that individuals within organizations are a diverse and frequently conflictual group, and that roles and functions are shaped by the individuals occupying them rather than vice versa.

Alternative Criteria for Assessing Organizational Effectiveness

The Organization as an Incentive Exchange System

If one views the organization as an incentive exchange system, then the effective organization will be one which allows individuals to satisfy personal self interest.

> Instead of goals being the key to organizational behavior, Barnard [1939] regarded the motives of the individuals participating in organizations as the critical determinants. ...For him, the purpose of the organization, rather than being the end to which the organization was oriented, was the means to the personal satisfaction of its contributors; it described that activity by which the energies of individuals are given (Georgiou, 1973, p. 300).

An effective system for allowing individuals to achieve those personal interests must provide (1) a diversity of incentives, (2) equity in exchanging incentives; and (3) some reasonable spread of the most valued incentives. Without these conditions some individuals will be systematically deprived of access to

desirable exchanges and others will find their exchanges unsatisfactory. The result, of course, will be the alienation of subgroups of individuals from the organization and their subsequent unwillingness to participate in collective activity.

Diversity. In order to be effective an exchange system must provide for a diversity of interests. If individual interests cannot be satisfied within the organization, participants will seek satisfaction externally. At the organizational level, then, this criterion would specify that the organization offer diverse incentives. At the subunit and individual level it would specify that successful individuals must offer multiple incentives to other subunits and individuals. The more interests an organization can meet, the more individuals it can attract and hold.

Equity. All transactions must meet the universal demand of equity, that is, the contributions or incentives exchanged must be of comparable value.

> It is this demand for equity which brings on transaction costs. If it is a requirement that a norm of reciprocity be supported, then it is necessary that each party to a transaction be satisfied that an equitable balance of contributions and payments has occurred. (Ouchi, 1979. p. 12)

If an incentive exchange system is analogous to a marketplace, then competition should provide reassurance to both parties that the exchange is equitable. The value of a given incentive will be determined by (1) its criticality to the individual, subunit, or organization, (2) its replaceability with another contribution, and (3) its availability. Individuals in command of

valuable incentives will be able to demand a high price and the exchange will still be equitable. However, inequitable exchanges--due to poor perception of the value of another's contribution or a monopoly on a particular incentive--can occur. And when they do the system is no longer working to satisfy individual self-interest.

Spread. Unfettered competition will be more likely to occur when incentives, especially valued incentives, are spread across the organization. If the valued incentives become concentrated at any one level, function, or office, most individuals will be unsuccessful in obtaining those incentives. Similarly the high competition will drive the costs up excessively and introduce the possibility of inequity in the transactions which do occur.

In summary, then, effective incentive exchange systems will maximize the self actualization of many organizational participants through (1) offering a diverse set of incentives, (2) insuring equity in the exchange process, and (3) allocating valued incentives broadly across the organization. The optimal exchange system will be highly active across the organization and all participants will find primary satisfaction from incentives located within the organization.

The Organizational as an Organized Anarchy

To some, no doubt, the concept of an organized anarchy being effective is as anomalous as the term organized anarchy itself. Could an organized anarchy ever be anything other than ineffective and inefficient? This author believes it could.

Organized anarchy is not a bureaucracy gone wild but rather a description of organizational phenomena under conditions of problematic preferences, unclear technology, and fluid participation (Cohen, March, and Olsen, 1972). The effective organized anarchy will allow its participants to create the peace and serenity of an order and rationality which seldom exists in real life situations. To do this the organization must (1) provide garbage cans or fora in which individuals can assert solutions, air opinions, or express concerns; (2) act in order to stimulate responses from an ambiguous environment; and (3) interpret both current activities and organizational history in meaningful and orderly ways. The everpresent danger in an organized anarchy is that the organization will become paralyzed by ambiguity and indecision and cease to act at all.

Garbage cans. The garbage can model of decision-making (Cohen, March, and Olsen, 1972) portrayed the complex interaction of elements in certain decisionmaking situations as like a garbage can. The term is used here in a similar manner to convey the image of a forum which serves many diverse purposes. Because organized anarchies are characterized by fluid participation, most issues are of low saliency to most participants most of the time. In order for even simple decisions to be made the organization must provide arenas or garbage cans where individuals can express their concerns, assert solutions not necessarily related to any current problem, and air opinions. High quality garbage cans are public sessions with broad and general topics such as long-term planning or organizational goals

(Cornell University, 1975). They accommodate nearly anything and draw the "garbage" away from practical decisions. Without garbage cans the garbage tends to litter the decision-making landscape to an extent that action (i.e., decisions) becomes difficult.

Action. Organized anarchies need to overcome the inertia of indecision. They need to act. Organized anarchies are collective responses to ambiguity and without action there will be no basis on which to (1) discorver preferences or (2) attribute meaning and order to events.

> Action, when viewed retrospectively, clarifies what the organization is doing, what business it is in, and what its projects may be. Inaction, viewed retrospectively, is more puzzling and more senseless: there is a greater likelihood for bizarre meanings to be attached and for an unhealthy amount of autism to be introduced. Action, in other words, provides tangible items that can be attended to. (Weick, 1979, p. 245)

Interpretation. The effective organized anarchy must be able to interpret creatively its actions to organizational participants. The actions themselves may be chaotic or random or trivial; but they must be strung together rationally, given meaning and order so that participants will be able to define the nature of the collectivity and the likely demands to be placed on them. Interpretation will vary over time and with the individual interpreting events, but unless individuals are able to construct a rationality, to identify the nature of the endeavor they are engaged in, they will cease participating.

In summary, then, organized anarchies are successful only when they can establish and communicate a rationality and order for the organization and its activities to the participants. This cannot be done unless individuals are given opportunities to pool their collective solutions, concerns, and insights, thus clearing the way for some concrete action, without which interpretation and ordering is impossible.

The Organization as a Process of Sensemaking

Given an ongoing stream of organizational experiences and the ability to attend to only a finite amount of information, individuals select certain phenomena as important, attend to these stimuli and order them in meaningful patterns. Selective retention is a function of man's limited ability to process and store information. As individuals form these causal chains or cause maps, they intersect and a negotiated, collective cause map is formed (Frost and Hayes, 1978).

> The negotiations which occur involve the exchange of information, as well as other resources, between individuals and groups of individuals. In the process the variables and assumed causal connections between variables are established as common and/or are disputed to varying degrees. So the maps negotiated provide the guidelines for "who does what, with and to whom, why, when and how." (Frost and Hayes, 1978, p. 11)

From this perspective an effective organization is one which achieves a socially-created organizational reality which is widely agreed and acted upon. If this is not achieved, then collective activity will be constrained by the need to clarify

roles, functions, and relationships. A shared and socially constructed organizational reality will be characterized by (1) congruence across individual and subunit cause maps, (2) richness in the streams of individual experiences and the meaning attributed to those experiences, and (3) wide access to the process of negotiating collective cause maps.

Congruence. Congruence is in many respects the sine qua non of collective sensemaking. Until agreement is reached on the meanings to be attributed to various organizational phenomena, there can be no collective reality, instead there are competing individual and subunit interpretations.

Because an individual's cause map is likely to vary over time and by situation, the collective organizational reality is frequently in flux. The process of negotiation is ongoing, and those individuals with the most power and influence will be able to influence the nature of organizational reality at any given time or situation.

Richness. Sensemaking encompasses more than helping organizational participants agree on procedures, problems, and strategies. It is what the organization in toto does.

> When an organization produces a cause map and superimposes it on subsequent occasions, it does in fact create the territory that it inhabits. ...The map, however, is itself a simplification, ignores large portions of the stream of experience, and might well produce a more rewarding existence if it were altered. (Weick, 1979, p. 250)

The satisfactoriness of the cause map the organization imposes on its environment is directly related to the richness of the individual cause maps and experiences which constitute it. Thus

an effective organization will seek to provide rich and varied experiences for its participants, allow those individuals to order those experiences in various ways, and be willing to adapt, alter and enrich existing views of organizational reality.

Access. The organization cannot benefit from individual inputs that are excluded. Individuals who are regularly excluded from the process of negotiating collective cause maps not only will not share in the social construction of organizational reality, but that reality will be poorer, and the organization's view of itself diminished by those missing inputs. For the organizational reality to be truly shared, operant, and rich, a broad representation of organizational participants need access to the process of negotiation.

In sum, the sensemaking perspective sensitizes us to the essentially closed nature of organizational systems (Weick, 1979). Constant effort must be maintained to solicit new views. The effective organization is a collective and constructed reality whose ongoing nature is shaped by negotiation among participants.

The Organization as a Variably Coupled System

Classical organizational theory portrayed the organization as a tightly coupled and bureaucratic system. All couplings were explicitly assumed to be tight and evidence to the contrary was viewed as evidence of dysfunction. However, current research and theory (Deal and Celotti, 1981; Weick, 1976) have changed our image of the organization from that of a tightly coupled system

to a variably coupled system. In a tightly coupled world, effectiveness is to achieve tight coupling, to be predictable and responsive. In a variably coupled world, one must be concerned with matching coupledness to situations. Thus the effective organization from this perspective is flexible and adaptive, adjusting linkages to conditions and problems. The effective organization is characterized by (1) buffers, subunits loosely coupled to the core organizational elements, which serve to protect those elements from environmental turbulence which at the same time communicate environmental conditions to other organizational elements; (2) attention to issue saliency, that is, enabling high saliency issues to generate tightly coupled responses, and (3) leadership flexibility--in a variably coupled organization leadership must also be variably coupled. When these characteristics do not exist conflict, frustration and missed opportunities can result, all affecting the ability of the organization to engage in collective activity.

Buffers. Buffers use loose coupling advantageously. Loose coupling allows semi-autonomous subunits to sense and respond to environmental changes without affecting core organizational elements. "Loosely coupled systems preserve more diversity in responding than do tightly coupled system, and therefore can adapt to a considerably wider range of changes in the environment than would be true for tightly coupled systems" (Weick, 1976, p. 7). At the same time loosely coupled systems localize trouble--loosely coupled subunits are semiautonomous in failure

and in success. Loosely coupling achieves this, partially, because it capitalizes on individual self-determination Individuals in loosely coupled situations have greater discretion of action than would occur in tightly coupled situations. Loose coupling serves collective actions by enhancing individuals' sense of efficacy, by providing for organizational response and experimentation, and by sheltering core elements from failure.

Issue saliency. Effective organizations will display loose coupling, yet still be able to muster a tightly coupled response to issues of high saliency. When something must be done--a proposal written, a product assembled--the organization is able to construct or activate tightly coupled subunits and/or procedures. The key is flexibility, matching response style to issues. The uniform application of a tightly coupled response style, according to Perrow (1979), will be a system drowning in danger signals. On the other hand, a uniformly loosely coupled response will tend to muffle warnings. The organization must be selective, able to discriminate, and perhaps most importantly, activate transient or even ad hoc tightly coupled systems within and among loosely coupled systems.

Leadership flexibility. To effectively utilize variable coupling, to allow individuals maximal discretion and self determination within the realm of collective action, leadership must be flexible. In particular, leadership must strive for isomorphism with organizational coupling. Loosely coupled subunits, individuals, and processes must be managed in a loosely coupled fashion. If this does not occur, leaders will rail at

the intransigence of subordinates, subordinates will erect barriers to protect their autonomy, and the conflict will decrease the likelihood that collective interests and actions will be served.

In sum, when seen from the perspective of variable couplings, the effective organization is flexible and adaptable. It provides a setting for collective action by allowing individuals to seek out and interact with individuals of similar interests. It allows the organization to provide structures and processes for integrating diverse views and interests, to maintain continuity in a turbulent environment.

The Organization as a Political Arena

The four alternatives described above have their roots in the observation that individuals within organizations hold diverse and sometimes conflicting interests, and focus on the outcome or order established as those differences are negotiated. But none pay explicit attention to the process whereby a given social order is established or maintained (Bacharach and Lawler, 1980). It is that process that the political perspective addresses.

> Survival in an organization is a political act. Corporations, universities, and voluntary associations are arenas for daily political action...politics in organizations involve the factional use of power to retain or obtain control of real of symbolic resources. (Bacharach and Lawler, 1981, p. 1)

From this perspective, effectiveness relates to the adequacy with which the political process smoothes differences and promotes collective activity. An effective political process must (1) provide arenas for negotiation and bargaining, (2) result in organizational action, and (3) circumvent coercion. A process which does not meet these criteria will tend to alienate individuals through exclusion or coercion. If the bargaining process does not lead to action, no gain or benefit will accrue to the involved parties.

Arenas. From this perspective the entire organization is seen as a political arena; negotiation is ongoing and involves all organizational participants. The question of effectiveness revolves around facilitating rather than managing the process of negotiating political interests. For the process to be effective participants need occasions for negotiating political interests or merely displaying power. An effective organization can do much to facilitate this process merely by providing occasions or opportunities (formally and informally) for potential competitors and potential interest groups to get together to discuss issues, test each other's strengths, and generally keep the process in motion. A lack of arenas for political interaction may prevent potential interest groups or coalitions from forming or prolong the process of negotiation.

Action. The effective political process of negotiating competing or conflicting interests must not inhibit collective action. At some point differences must be resolved, temporary

truces established, and a semblance of order negotiated. Then collective activity is possible. The danger, of course, is that the organization will consume inordinate amounts of resources, energy, and attention in the political process and generate insufficient organizational activity.

Coercion. Coercion is the actual use of power. Within organizations power is used both to control and to negotiate (Bacharach and Lawler, 1980; Lotto, 1981).

> Superiors may use coercion to eliminate poor performance, dissident action, or rule breaking by subordinates. The coercion or force is essentially a substitute for, or an attempt to avoid, bargaining with subordinates over the issues in conflict. In an actual bargaining context, however, coercion might be used at key points to engender a softer concession stance by the opponent. In bargaining, it can become a tactic for speeding up the process of conflict resolution. (Bacharach and Lawler, 1980, p. 174)

In an effective organization, coercion will rarely be resorted to. As a substitute for bargaining it alientates individuals by denying them the right to negotiate. In a bargaining situation coercion is likely to be only the threat of coercion, but even that is potentially damaging to individuals' sense of efficacy and potential for later cooperation. According to Bacharach and Lawler (1980, p. 184), "a threat tactic will be less effective to the extent that compliance leads to loss of face."

In summary, then, the political perspective highlights the use of power and the process of negotiating. It is an action perspective and the criteria for effectiveness relate to facilitating that process. Providing means or opportunities for

communication and confrontation, not allowing the political process to interfere with collective action, and not abbreviating the process through coercion are all characteristics of effective organizations when reviewed as political arenas.

Summary and Conclusions: Organizational Evaluation

In the preceeding sections of this paper, I have argued that organizational effectiveness ought to play a role in educational evaluation, and that the development of alternative perspectives for viewing organizations could be a starting point for revisiting organizational evaluation in education. Five perspectives were characterized and alternative criteria for evaluating organizations developed for each. Table 1 highlights these criteria. These are presented not as fully developed "models" but merely as preliminary indications of the directions evaluation could move in this area. Although the criteria presented are general, as a group they indicate the range of criteria that could be applied in thinking about orqanizational effectiveness. Each perspective needs to be more fully conceptualized; the criteria need validation. It may be profitable to consider whether certain contexts, situations, or programs are more appropriate to certain perspectives. If, as Berman (1979) has suggested, we need to mix and match policy implementation strategies with policy context, ought we not mix and match evaluative criteria and models with organizational context?

Although the thrust of this paper has been divergent--to describe alternative perspectives, and suggest derivative criteria of effectiveness, I'd like to close on a note of convergence. In looking across the criteria for assessing effectiveness described above, some items received multiple citations. What they suggest is the possibility of a generalized theory of organizational effectiveness, comparable perhaps to Frost and Hayes (1978) generalized theory of organizing. Implicit across most of the perspectives were three "themes" of effectiveness. Organizations, in general:

- o Need to act--Organizations need to engage in collective activity. Without it they tend to fall apart. Action is the centrifugal force which orders, structures and gives meaning to organizations. Anything which interferes, delays, or prohibits action is dysfunctional.
- o Need to attribute meaning to their actions--Actions alone are insufficient. They tend to be chaotic, random, or trivial. However, when they are ordered and interpreted, individuals and subunits can use them to "spin webs of significance" (Geertz, 1973).
- o Need individual participation--Organizations are collectivities and excluding individuals either consciously or unconsciously is debilitating to the organization's potential for action. Instead,

efforts must be made to maintain the good will, self-determination, and participation of all organizational members.

REFERENCES

Averch, H. A., Carroll, S. J., Donaldson, T. S., Kiesling, H. J., and Pincus, J. How effective is schooling? (R-956-PCSF1RC). Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, March 1972.

Austin, G. R. Exemplary schools and the search for effectiveness. Educational Leadership, October 1979, 37 (1), pp. 10-14.

Bacharach, S. B. and Lawler, E. J. Power and politics in organizations. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1980.

Barnard, C. I. The functions of the executive. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1938.

Benson, J. K. Innovation and crisis in organizational analysis. In J. K. Benson (ed.) Organizational analysis: critique and innovation. Beverly Hills, California: Sage, 1977, pp. 5-18.

Berman, P. Designing implementation to match policy situations: A contingency analysis of programmed and adaptive implementation. Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1978.

Berman, P. and McLaughlin, M. V. Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. VIII: Implementing and sustaining innovations. (R-1589/8-HEW). Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, May 1978.

Brown, R. H. Bureaucracy as praxis: toward a political phenomenology of formal organizations. Administrative Science Quarterly, September 1978, 23, pp. 365-382.

Cameron, K. S., and Whetten, D. A. Perceptions of organizational effectiveness over organizational life cycles. Administrative Science Quarterly, December 1981, 26 (4), pp. 525-44.

Clark, D. L., Lotto, L. S., and McCarthy, M. M. Secondary source study of exceptionality in urban elementary schools. In Why Do Some Urban Schools Succeed? Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1980, pp. 144-225.

Cohen, M. D., March, J. G., and Olsen, J. P. A garbage can model of organizational choice. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1972, 17, pp. 1-25.

Deal, T. E. and Celotti, L. D. How much influence do (and can) educational administrators have on classrooms? Kappan, March 1980, 61(7), pp. 471-3.

Edmonds, R. Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, October 1979, 37(1), pp. 15-23.

Geertz, C. The interpretation of cultures. New York: Basic Books, 1973.

Georgiou, P. The goal paradigm and notes towards a counter paradigm. Administrative Science Quarterly, 18, 1973, pp. 291-310.

Guba, E. G. Toward a methodology of naturalistic inquiry in educational evaluation. Center for the Study of Evaluation, University of California at Los Angeles, 1978.

Hannan, M. T., and Freeman, J. The population ecology of organizations. American Journal of Sociology, 1977, 82, pp. 929-64.

Lawrence, P. R., and Lorsch, J. W. Organization and environment. Homewood, Illinois: R. D. Irwin, 1979.

Light, D., Jr. Surface data and deep structure: Observing the organization of professional training. Administrative Science Quarterly, December 1979, 24(4), pp. 551-559.

Lotto, L. S. Understanding power in educational organizations. In D. L. Clark, S. McKibbin, and M. Malkas (eds.), Alternative perspectives for viewing educational organizations. San Francisco, California: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development, 1981.

March, J. G. and Olsen, J. P. Ambiguity and choice in organizations. Oslo, Norway: Universitetforlaget, 1976.

Paul, P. A. Change processes at the elementary, secondary, and postsecondary levels of education. In N. Nash and J. Culbertson (eds.) Linking Processes in Educational Improvement. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1977, pp. 7-73.

Scriven, M. Pros and cons about goal-free evaluation. Evaluation Comment, December 1976.

Sproull, L., Weiner, S., and Wolf, D. Organizing an anarchy: Belief, bureaucracy and politics in the National Institute for Education. University of Chicago Press, 1978.

Stufflebeam, D. L., Foley, W. J., Gephart, W. J., Guba, E. G., Hammond, R. L., Merriman, H. O., & Provus, M. M. Educational evaluation and decision-making in education. Itasca, Illinois: Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1971.

Weber, M. The theory of social and economic organization, A. M. Henderson and T. Parsons, trans. New York: Free Press, 1947.

Weick, K. E. Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1976, 21, pp. 1-19.

Weick, K. E. The social psychology of organizing. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley, 1979 (2nd edition).

Worthen, B. R. and Sanders, J. Educational evaluation: theory and practice. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1973.

REFERENCE NOTES

The elementary tactics of administrative action. Unpublished manuscript (EDP:75:18), Ithaca, new York: Cornell University, Graduate School of Business and Public Administration, 1975.

Frost, P. J., and Hayes, D. C. Having one's cake and eating it too: middle range content and generalized process as ways of understanding organization. A paper presented at the Middle Range Theory Conference, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada, 1978.

Goodman, P. S. Organizational effectiveness as a decision making process. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Academy of Management, Atlanta, Georgia, 1979.

Ouchi, W. G. Markets, bureaucracies, and clans (MGL-59). Los Angeles: Graduate School of Management, University of California, July 1979.

Perrow, C. TMI: A normal accident. Unpublished manuscript, State University of New York at Stony Brook, 1979.

Weick, K. E. Loosely coupled systems: Relaxed meanings and thick interpretations. Unpublished manuscript, Cornell University, 1980.